

- a) **Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?** The parcels being transferred are nominal in size and of little value. Any financial or long term implications are negligible.
- b) **What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?** The financial cost of not implementing this legislation is probably very small. The continued inefficiency of three departments involved in the management of a single P-Patch is a small hidden cost.
- c) **Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?** FAS is originating this legislation for its own benefit and the benefit of SDOT. DON is the receiving city department of minor property interests held by FAS and SDOT. Staff at SDOT and DON are in agreement with the proposed legislation.
- d) **What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?** An alternative would be to do nothing and continue to have three Departments involved in the management of the P-Patch. There is no alternative that would effectively bring control of the P-Patch under the Department of Neighborhoods.
- e) **Is a public hearing required for this legislation?** No.
- f) **Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?** No.
- g) **Does this legislation affect a piece of property?** Yes, a map of the property is attached as Exhibit A.
- h) **Other Issues:** None.

List attachments to the fiscal note below:

Exhibit A: Map of Site